

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ABN CORPORATION, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GROUPE PELM INTERNATIONAL
CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 23-cv-00004-RFL

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RELIEF FROM NON-DISPOSITIVE
PRETRIAL ORDER OF
MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Re: Dkt. No. 196


Magistrate Judge Cisneros recently compelled Defendants Victoria Brieant and her law office (collectively, “Brieant”) to produce certain documents. (*See* Dkt. No. 195 (the “MJ Order”).) Judge Cisneros also authorized Plaintiffs to depose Brieant. Brieant now moves to vacate the MJ Order. (*See* Dkt. No. 196 (the “Motion”).) Having reviewed the record and Brieant’s *in camera* submission of the documents in question, the Court **DENIES** the Motion.

Brieant’s role in the documents at issue appears consistent with her overall role as a business agent conveying Pellegrini’s position to counterparties. The documents do not appear to involve seeking or providing legal advice, and Brieant introduces no evidence showing additional context to support such a finding. As such, the MJ order properly concluded that the documents ordered produced are not privileged. Moreover, given the relevance of the overall nature of Brieant’s relationship with Pellegrini and her role in the subject transaction and similar ones, the documents were appropriately ordered produced in non-redacted form. As for Brieant’s deposition, there was no error in permitting Plaintiffs to notice a deposition (without requiring them to do so) in lieu of continuing with the written discovery previously sought from Brieant, due to the parties’ inability to effectively meet and confer to narrow their written

discovery disputes. Because that deposition was permitted as a substitute for a narrow category of written discovery, it does not make sense to reopen discovery generally. Finally, the dispute, if any, regarding the location of Briant's deposition is not properly within the scope of the Motion, as it is not clear if the parties are unable to agree on that issue after meeting and conferring on the topic, and Judge Cisneros did not rule on any such dispute in the MJ Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 22, 2025



RITA F. LIN
United States District Judge